



GARY R. HERBERT  
Governor

SPENCER J. COX  
Lieutenant Governor

# State of Utah

## DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

MICHAEL R. STYLER  
Executive Director

### Division of Oil, Gas and Mining

JOHN R. BAZA  
Division Director

June 8, 2015

Mike Dalley  
Staker Parsons Companies  
89 West 13490 South, Suite 100  
Draper, Utah 84020

Subject: Tenth Review of Notice of Intention to Commence Large Mining Operations, Staker Parsons Companies, Beef Hollow Facility, M/035/0042, Salt Lake County, Utah

Dear Mr. Parsons:

On May 19, 2015, the Division of Oil, Gas and Mining received by e mail a review response for the Beef Hollow facility. The e mail included Figure 08, 08A, 09, 10, 11, and 12. The attached comments for the above listed Figures and previous comments from prior submittals will need to be addressed before tentative approval may be granted.

Several of the comments from the previous review were not addressed or only partially addressed. Please contact the Division to arrange a meeting to discuss these issues if you do not understand or disagree with the comments.

Please contact Leslie Heppler at 801-538-5257, Peter Brinton at 801-538-5258 or me at 801-538-5261 if you have any questions about the review. Thank you for your cooperation in completing this permitting action.

Sincerely,

Paul B. Baker  
Minerals Program Manager

PBB: lah: eb

Attachment: Review

cc bryson.hinkins@stakerparson.com, City of Herriman

P:\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M035-SaltLake\M0350042-BeefHollowFacility\final\REV10-6649-60012015.doc





**TENTH REVIEW OF NOTICE OF INTENTION  
TO COMMENCE LARGE MINING OPERATIONS**

**Staker Parsons Company  
Beef Hollow Mine  
M/035/0042  
June 8, 2015**

**General Comments:**

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
1	General	(No response needed.) The Division may have additional comments based on submittals received in the future.	lah	
2	General	Please submit good quality color copies on the final revision. The Division needs color pages for the photos and maps in Appendices A, D, and F.	lah	
3	Appendix H	Redline and strikeout will not be needed in the final document.	lah	
4	Appendix	A vegetation survey is now in Appendix D, but the text on page 17 refers to Appendix F. Please change the letter "F" to the letter "D" and include the proper reference in the table of contents. This comment was included in the previous review but has not been addressed.	lah	

**R647-4-105 - Maps, Drawings & Photographs**

**105.3 - Drawings or Cross Sections (slopes, roads, pads, etc.)**

5	Figure 8	<p>Please identify the following on Figure 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- any ditches adjacent to the highway;</li> <li>- berms and ditches (such as those shown along the road, mining, and permit boundaries) to prevent run-off, including the south permit boundary to the west of the culvert, and east of the culvert where some stormwater and sediment dropped off the ridge into Wood Hollow;</li> <li>- berms and ditches at permit boundaries to minimize run-on, consistent with the statement on page 21 that "stormwater run-on will be managed as much as possible in natural drainage areas;"</li> <li>- the roads within the permit boundaries;</li> <li>- the locations of fuel storage and other potentially deleterious materials;</li> <li>- identify any check dams.</li> </ul> <p>These modified comments were largely included in a previous review but have not been addressed.</p>	pnb	
6	Figure 8	<p>The Basin 1 (old Basin 6), Basin 2, and Basin 3 watersheds should be identified correctly, and the acreage updated. See the attached image with approximate boundaries clarified. Calculations will need to be updated.</p> <p>This comment is consolidated from previous reviews.</p>	pnb	



7	Figure 8	Please provide a design flow for Basin 6 to determine whether the existing culvert below the large road fill in Wood Hollow is adequate to convey the peak flow of the design storm, or document for the Division that this culvert has at least as large a cross-sectional area as the UDOT culvert under the highway. A larger storm size from an elevation significantly further up the Basin 6 contributing area (Wood Hollow) should be used.  The essence of this comment was included in a previous review but has not been addressed.	pnb	
	Figure 8	It appears that adequately sized culverts may be needed beneath the road in one or more drainages in Basin 2, particularly if the existing road is to remain after reclamation.	pnb	
8	Figure 9	Any post-reclamation roads should be clearly identified. Identify the Woods Hollow culvert and any other culverts that are to remain after reclamation.  A larger version of this comment was included in previous reviews, and this part has not been addressed.	pnb	
9	Figure 9	Please label the contour intervals, so they are readable (as was done with the March 11, 2015, submittal).	lah	
10	Fig 10-12	Label all slope angles, (as was done with the March 11, 2015 submittal).	lah	

#### **R647-4-109 - Impact Assessment**

##### **109.3 – Soils**

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
11	Pg 26	The text says “Highwalls will be left no greater than 3H:1V” and final slopes not to exceed “3H:1,” but the cross sections on Figures 10, 11 and 12 show 2H:1V slopes. Please correct this apparent discrepancy. This comment was included in the previous review and has not been addressed.	lah	

#### **R647-4-110 - Reclamation Plan**

##### **113 – Surety**

Comment #	Sheet/Page/Map/Table #	Comments	Initials	Review Action
13	Appendix G page 1	The reclamation cost estimate summary sheet indicates the costs used were from 2012, but these costs are from 2014. This summary sheet also indicates the area bonded is 589 acres, but Figure 7 notes 410 acres for phase 1. Please make appropriate corrections and add the escalation year of 2019. This comment was included in the previous review but has not been addressed.	lah	